THEOLOGY

VOL. XLIX MARCH, 1946 No. 309

Editorial

DURING Lent an English churchman would do well to read some—or one—of (what used to be called) our standard divines. Hooker, for example, if you have not read him lately. If they are not on your shelves, the works of our standard divines can be discovered with comparative ease in any old library or in a secondhand-book shop. It is distressing to reflect that there is no work of divinity that one can safely assume all readers—even all ordained readers—of THEOLOGY to have read at least once. The individual churchman loses much from lack of acquaintance with traditional divinity, and still more serious is the impoverishment of a Church whose members are without such common standards of theological reference. Our contemporary divinity lacks roots in an historical tradition, but the tradition is still there, waiting to be rediscovered and reinterpreted.

There seems to be a widespread, if unavowed, assumption that any theological works published, say, before 1900 must be more or less obsolete. How many of the old works is an ordinary theological student now expected to read? Do not mention the dangers of theological antiquarianism; we do not at present need to be warned against them. On the contrary, we need to be encouraged to increase our familiarity with the corpus of traditional English divinity.

The lives of the Anglican worthies are also well worth reading. Dean Burgon's *Lives of Twelve Good Men* is an excellent appetizer. We have lately read Lives of Dean Hook[1] and Bishop Blomfield,[2] and have wondered why we have never heard them recommended. Hook and Blomfield are among the less publicized but most eminent leaders of the Church of England in the nineteenth century. Both were firmly rooted in, and resolutely loyal to, "church principles," which they interpreted more broadly and objectively than the Tractarians. They succeeded in showing that the *via media* is anything but dull or safe or compromising. Are there any eminent Victorians who have a finer record of constructive achievement than Hook as Vicar of Leeds or Blomfield as Bishop of London?

Of Blomfield it is said that "in the earlier part of his ministerial life he had thoroughly read the best of our own great divines." Hook began his ministry at Whippingham in the Isle of Wight, and set himself a prodigious course of reading, details of which are given in the *Life*. He carried it through in six or seven years and was thus prepared for his strenuous and harassing activities at Coventry and Leeds. At Leeds he used to get up at four o'clock in the morning in order to read and write. He preached daily in Lent. There were giants in those days.

[1] *The Life and Letters of Walter Farquhar Hook.* By W. R. W. Stephens. 2 vols. 1878.
[2] *A Memoir of Charles James Blomfield, D.D., Bishop of London, with selections from his correspondence.* By Alfred Blomfield. 2 vols. 1863.

Who knows the Will of God?

HUMAN conduct is something which occurs irrespective of the particular creed which any group of people or any particular persons profess; and all human conduct must be judged according to what is right or wrong, however crude, mistaken or perverted are the ideas of what constitutes right or wrong. The Christian believes that this is God's universe, and that the nature of God is declared in the fact that He so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish but have everlasting life. Now, what of the countless millions who know nothing of the Christian Gospel, as well as those who know vaguely something of the Gospel but have not responded in faith and love? Have they any knowledge of God and of the will of God? Ought we to say, by way of honouring the Christian Gospel rightly, that the non-Christian knows nothing whatever of the will of the true God? No, this does not truly honour God, but bows Him out of His own universe. If the Christian Gospel makes clear to man, for the first time, both all the knowledge of God and how much man has departed from the will of God, then God as a fact and a power is absent from the lives of most of His creatures. But if this universe is indeed created and sustained by God it is impossible that anyone can live in it and be completely unaware of God. However deeply the universe is astray from the will of God, it cannot have lost all trace of God's workmanship without being utterly destroyed. Indeed, since this is God's universe, and since the process of life belongs to the living God, the very fact of living confronts us with the claim of the living God. To learn how to live means to learn the will of God. This is not to equate the will of God with the pressure of the immediate situation, but only to say that God is in the pressure of the immediate situation, and that to understand and act rightly in the situations of life is an important part of learning to understand and obey the will of God. No one who lives in God's universe can escape some knowledge of God and His will. And, what is more, the claim of the living God is present with us in every pressure which life exerts upon us. He meets us in every act of living.

It is, of course, true that the limits of such knowledge are drastic and must be frankly recognized. This is a knowledge of God which is widely imagined to be no knowledge of God at all; and in any case it is not a knowledge of God's will which delivers us from acting in disobedience to Him. We may say that the knowledge of God's will which comes from the mere fact of living in God's universe is bound to be incomplete, distorted and rebellious. It is incomplete because it does not touch or touch deeply the higher meanings of life. We may gain an understanding in this way of the more immediate ways in which human conduct should reflect God's will for human life, but we do not gain an understanding of the major issues, the influence of which presses down into details. It is also distorted because, apart from the revelation of God in Jesus Christ our Lord, any knowledge that we gain about the will of God is not seen in its true perspective. The amount of distortion probably varies considerably. Some people seem

to keep such knowledge of God's will as they gain from ordinary living remarkably free from distortion, even though they acknowledge no Christian allegiance; but others are manifestly distorted even in that which they see truly because of the absence of the saving peace of Christ. And such knowledge is also rebellious. It is by no means always rebellious in the conscious attitude of particular persons. For one thing, God is not there for the majority of people to rebel against. For another thing, to have the insight that it is rebellious is not a superficial judgment, but it is a profundity which is hidden from those who trust such knowledge alone. It is rebellious because we share by living in the common situation of humanity which has fallen from the purpose of God and is antagonistic to the purpose of God. Mankind is in a state of rebellion against God, and so the knowledge of God's will which we acquire by living, whatever our personal sincerity, is knowledge gained in the rebels' camp, and needing the reconciliation of God. But while these serious limitations have to be placed on the knowledge of God's will which is gained by living in God's universe, it must also be said that within limits and for certain purposes it is utterly sound. The proper care of the human body is part of our obedience to the will of God, and we can understand this only by taking proper account of the process of living. A devout Christian may be less trustworthy as to this part of keeping the law of God than an atheist who has been genuinely concerned to understand the way the human body works and how best to treat it. All the lessons of life are lessons of how to live in God's universe and, although what people take to be the lessons of life may merely be conformity to the world, yet there are many lessons gained by experience of living which comes to both believer and unbeliever and are quite genuinely knowledge of the will of God.

What, then, we may ask, is the relation of the knowledge of God's redemption in Christ Jesus to knowledge such as this? This is a most important question. We may take this knowledge of God gained through living in His universe as the foundation upon which we rest, and the Christian Gospel becomes an ornamental superstructure and not the ground plan of our understanding of life. This is not the true Christian view. St Paul wrote to the Corinthians (I, iii, 11): "Other foundation can no man lay than that which is laid, which is Jesus Christ." And this must be true of our knowledge of God. It is not that mankind has no knowledge of God when it comes to Christ, but rather that in the assent to the truth of Jesus Christ's claim to lordship over us, all that is in us is brought to the bar of this judgment, and cleansed and revised. And whatever is carried over into the Christian life rests upon our knowledge of God in Christ which is the foundation of our living. In point of fact, though there have been mistaken attempts to deny the knowledge of God gained by living in His universe, the latest of which is that of Karl Barth, the Christian faith does not eliminate such knowledge, but establishes it in its limited and secondary position with a certainty which is otherwise lacking. The non-Christian swings from the pole of over-optimistic affirmation of the knowledge of God in ordinary life to over-pessimistic denial of its truth and validity. The

Christian remains serene, not expecting to learn from the processes of daily life the profundities of the Christian Gospel, but humbly confident of the power of the Christian Gospel to enable him to interpret and fulfil the will of God as it claims him for daily life. There are not two opposed sources of our understanding of the will of God—the Christian Gospel on the one hand, and life on the other. Jesus Christ is the Lord of all life; and we have not learned the meaning either of Jesus Christ or of the processes of our life unless we know this as living conviction. The Christian Gospel declares the meaning of what people have learnt confusedly and distortedly in life. And yet, in a sense, there are two sources from which we must learn God's will. Or, rather, we must learn the meaning of Jesus Christ not only in the Gospel but in life. And we must be prepared to learn something of His meaning in and for life from people whose knowledge of Him in the Gospel is non-existent or false. But the knowledge of the will of God in the Gospel is the knowledge of the ultimate meaning of life and of the ultimate power to achieve that meaning. And for this knowledge there is no substitute. Only those who live by faith in Christ share in this knowledge.

We can affirm this, for two reasons. In the first place, without the Christian Gospel men are astray from God. There may be many non-Christians who in the fineness of their insight and the greatness of their living are much greater than poor specimens of Christian people. But the fact remains that these non-Christians for all their greatness are standing under allegiance to that which is not only inadequate to but hostile to the will of God. It may be difficult also to assess the differing worth of a living Christian faith combined with a poor understanding and mastery of the processes of life as contrasted with an able and rich understanding and mastery of the processes of life on the basis of a non-Christian philosophy, but the Christian must choose the former. He does not regard it as an inevitable choice, because God is one, and he knows that his redemption in Christ Jesus helps and does not hinder his understanding of detailed living. It is probable that the Christian who bungles the living of life would make at least as great a bungle if he were not a Christian, and the greatness and glory of his faith would not be ever felt. There is always a strong temptation to be dazzled by cleverness and success, but we must put faith first, and see that the greatest and deepest gulf in human life is between those who trust in Christ and those who do not. Man is astray from God and in Christ Jesus is the reconciliation. Unless that is true the Christian Gospel is destroyed. The knowledge of God gained from living in His universe, however meagre and however false, bulks very large in the actual experience of men and women. But in the ultimate testing it is always ambiguous and only has abiding life on the foundation of the Gospel.

Secondly, apart from Christ the great conflicts of life cannot be truly overcome. This is the faith of the Christian Church: it cannot be proved. It cannot be proved because it is possible for some of the conflicts to be covered over and not really healed on some other than a Christian basis. At the present time the conflicts are not covered over but are exposed, and sapping the energies of the life of the world.

The Christian Church is at the disadvantage owing to the decay of her essential faith of not being able in any outstanding measure to point to the mastery of the conflicts in her own life. But it is of the heart of Christian faith to believe that the great conflicts can be mastered by Jesus Christ and that they cannot be mastered apart from Him.

If, then, it is only through the reconciliation in Christ Jesus that we truly know and can truly obey the will of God (and yet there is a vast amount of knowledge of the will of God, secondary in ultimate perspective, but of considerable importance for the well-being of our lives, which can only be gained as we learn the right lessons from the experience of living), what is the relation of the knowledge of Christ as Saviour to the discerning of the will of God in daily living? It means, in the first place, an immense simplification of life. This comes because sin, which is a barrier preventing the true love of God and the true love of man, is a divisive force breaking down the unity of human life. The power of the Cross in reconciliation simplifies man's desires and his problems. It puts the centre of life in the love of Christ our Lord. Now it may be that in point of fact to be a Christian and to seek to love Christ does not give us a greater and more persistent love of our fellowmen. But no one can doubt who reads the New Testament that it is meant to do so. And in countless instances this is the effect which living Christian faith has had. This simplicity of faith means being caught up into the everlasting purpose of God and finding a constancy of direction and effort because Christ is the Way, the Truth and the Life, and because this way is inexhaustible in its claim and in its richness. It means, further, a simplicity which is not called upon to flounder in the immense complications which result from false and untrustworthy ways of life. Many human possibilities are ruled out of account for the Christian: he has not to bother with them; he has only to be concerned with living the Christian life. It is, however, also true that the knowledge of Christ as Saviour brings its own complication into life from which the unbeliever is free. For one thing, the Christian brings to life a new and higher standard which he cannot afford to forget when the tendency of the times is against him and when it would be much easier to adopt the line of least resistance. For another thing, the Christian because of his faith ought to be concerned about issues in public life essential to the maintenance of human life according to the purpose of God which are difficult and unpleasant. The tendency of his faith is to drive him to seek trouble, not to avoid it. It would be simpler not to have this faith in a Saviour who judges as well as saves. And then again the Christian is not only concerned about the common life he shares with all men, he is concerned with the distinctive life of the Church of God. This is an additional responsibility in his life; it is at times a difficult and dangerous responsibility. It may indeed be a great means of grace to the Christian, but no one can deny that of itself it complicates rather than simplifies life. And because of this the Christian who by his faith is driven to identify himself with the life of his community, not living in selfish isolation, but seeking to raise the common standards, may be set apart and set himself apart from his community in order that truly human standards may be vindicated.

To be a Christian is a great thing. It is a great simplification of life; but it must not be forgotten that it brings its additional burdens as we live our lives.

But, further, we ought to say that to know Jesus Christ as Saviour should bring to our daily living a strength and a humility. It should bring a strength in that we are given the privilege of sharing the inner secret of God's universe and of living our lives in a deepening companionship with Christ our Lord. We make great claims for Christ, and that is right—for our hope is not in ourselves but in His centrality, His adequacy, His sufficiency for all things. But unless to live in Him means a strength in the actual testing experiences of life then we have nothing to offer a non-Christian world. The reflection of Christ's strength in ours may be a totally inadequate indication of His greatness, but its presence is indispensable. And there is sufficient testimony to its presence. But perhaps we ought to stress most that the knowledge of Christ as Saviour will make Christians humble in discerning the will of God in daily living. The Christian Gospel is no creation of ours and we can take no credit for it. And though by means of it we understand the ultimate meaning of life, that does not give us an advantage over other human beings in discerning the immediate tasks however much it gives to us in enabling us to see the place of those tasks in the purpose of God. Christians will be humble because they will know that non-Christians who have not their privileges may yet be better than they are in discerning the detailed will of God; they will be humble in seeking patiently to learn from anyone and from any situation that the meaning of the Gospel and the demand of God on a particular occasion may be brought into living unity. The Christian is at once stayed upon the Rock of Ages which is Christ and not seeking, because he is found of God, and at the same time seeking patiently, persistently, unweariedly, with all sorts and conditions of men, what the living God is teaching in the experience of living in His universe.

H. Cunliffe-Jones.

Bradford.

Homage to a Great Philosopher

The passing of a great philosopher does not as a rule attract very much attention in the press, though the better newspapers will accord him an obituary notice of fitting solemnity. His academic distinctions, his published works, perhaps even the school of philosophy to which he belonged (if this is known or can be stated): these will probably be listed without comment, and no more. If, however, the philosopher happens to be distinguished in some other field of inquiry or action, this circumstance will be alluded to with special emphasis, as if the fact that a professional thinker could undertake anything practical or related to mundane affairs were evidence almost of humanity. On the strength of being distinguished in several spheres other than that of pure speculation, the late R. G. Collingwood was accorded the honour of having his picture in an illustrated weekly.

A. E. Taylor, whose death was announced a few months ago, was a man of vast learning and of many gifts, all of which went to swell

his philosophical reputation. In academic circles this was very high; for he was one of the few professional philosophers of whom it might be said that he was truly academic without being pedantic or dry-as-dust. Even those scholars and thinkers who took exception to his general point of view—and there were many, especially as his thought took a theistic direction—could not for a moment deny his mastery of the art of thought, of exposition, and of scholarly exegesis. Few indeed there were who attempted to cross swords with him: first, because his philosophical statements were so weighty and authoritative, and secondly because an attitude of lofty assurance, not to be confused with arrogance or dogmatism, dissuaded all but the most rash from challenging him to a show-down. A. E. Taylor was the kind of thinker who, faced with a problem or a poser, thought nothing of forthwith moving up the whole of his vast apparatus of learning and logic to deal with it on the spot. The effect was overwhelming. With him, philosophy never once degenerated into skirmishing, logical sword-play, smart rejoinders, the scoring of small points off opponents, the gloating over the detection of minute inconsistencies, and all the rest of the jejune game of academic philosophizing. His work never failed to exhibit the candour and balance characteristic of all philosophical inquiry of the highest kind. His controversies (for these he could not avoid) were undertaken with grace. His conclusions were stated with quiet confidence. Of the works of his fellow-practitioners, however different in outlook, he knew far more than they as a rule did of his. He was perhaps the most selfless exponent of the art of thought in our day.

To the general public—that is, to the widest of that comparatively limited public that philosophical works ever reach—A. E. Taylor was best known as the author of that massive work *The Faith of a Moralist*, which had originally formed the Gifford Lectures for 1926-28. When it first appeared, the book was greeted with respectful attention by almost every class of thinker. As an Anglo-Catholic, A. E. Taylor won the admiration of Roman Catholics; as a believer in the Christian revelation, of the sceptics, agnostics, and atheists; as an exponent of orthodox philosophy, of the Logical Positivists and philosophical analysts; as a scholar, of all scholars. Moreover, the two fat volumes were written in a style of such clarity and charm that, but for the rather forbidding title (a phrase has apparently only to contain the word "moral" in it for most people, however worthy, to be put off immediately), it might have reached many people to whom the idea of reading a book demanding "thought" occurs but once or twice in a lifetime.

The Faith of a Moralist is undoubtedly one of the most important works dealing with the relation of ethics to religion ever written. Beside it, the little treatises on moral theory that have issued from the universities since the last war seem absurdly cramped, smug, and pedantic. Indeed, it would not be an exaggeration to say that the section entitled "The Theological Implications of Morality" knocks the bottom out of all the positivist, pragmatic, and relativist theories of morals that have appeared in our time. And it does so by the Socratic method of taking these philosophical systems, or half-systems, at their

word and pushing their implications to the point at which they turn inside-out and reveal a nest of contradictions. In comparison with this cathedral of a treatise, books of the type of Westermarck's *Ethical Relativity* and even Ross's *The Right and the Good* are seen to resemble the cheapest prefabricated structures. And going farther back, the systems of Herbert Spencer, Bain, and Sidgwick stick out like speculative follies perched upon the naked rock of nineteenth-century materialism.

To survey the *corpus* of A. E. Taylor's works is to appreciate not merely the length of his philosophical career but its remarkable development. An early book entitled *The Problem of Conduct* takes us back to the period in which Bradley and Bosanquet were in their prime. Unlike Bradley's *Ethical Studies*, to which in many ways it is not inferior, it has never been a philosophical best-seller. The *Elements of Metaphysics*, which came later, fared a great deal better. Prompted to revise it after the last war, the author took the opportunity not merely to incorporate and discuss many of the new ideas of Whitehead and Alexander but to indicate the path along which his meditations on theology and natural religion had meanwhile led him. This new preface is a document of great importance for the understanding of his philosophical position; and the new edition, with its extensive and profound additions, forms an introduction to the study of philosophical inquiry equalled by few other modern works and in point of style surpassed by none. During the last thirty years, a great many introductions to philosophy have been published, for there has been a minor boom in the sort of speculation which made the Brains Trust popular, and which stimulates the assembly of discussion groups of young people anxious to "get down to fundamentals"—and, it may be added, to get down quickly. What satisfies this popular interest is usually a great deal less than rigorous logical argument, though it takes easily and avidly to the kind of "demolition squad" technique of our young Logical Positivists, and it is often content with the mere enunciation of points of view. A. E. Taylor's approach is less exciting, more sober; he defines his problems, analyses them, draws tentative conclusions, refers the reader to relevant works, and more often than not shuns the luxury of finality. His book is at once instruction in and demonstration of the true philosophical dialectic: dialectic, that is to say, as a *method* of inquiry and not as the component of a pseudo-political ideology. Throughout the book he holds firmly to the rule that the choice before us is not between philosophizing and not philosophizing, but between philosophizing well and philosophizing badly. "Logic," he writes, "like metaphysics, deals with everything, not in the sense of being another name for the whole of our knowledge, but in the sense that it, unlike the special sciences, attacks a problem which confronts us in every exercise of our thought."

If we were concerned with a detailed survey of A. E. Taylor's works, we should need to speak at length of such masterpieces of scholarship as his Commentary on the *Timæus* and the other studies of Plato and Aristotle, together with his specifically theological contributions to such volumes as *Essays Catholic and Critical* and the *Encyclopædia of Religion*

and Ethics.[1] It would be interesting, too, to trace the profound and salutary influence exerted by his writings upon philosophers no less and perhaps even more original than himself: Whitehead, for instance. The latter has repeatedly acknowledged a debt to him, and indeed there is a good deal of evidence to suggest that Whitehead's philosophy, in spite of its great originality, would have taken a different course but for A. E. Taylor's classical scholarship. Even in the shorter essays such as those contained in the more recent *Philosophical Studies*, he provides the most searching analyses of questions that modern philosophers tend too often to leave worse confounded. A remark of his on the subject of knowledge comes to mind opportunely: "knowledge is distinguished from mere belief," he says, "by being vision." Such visionary presentation, such a stamp of authenticity, is precisely that which characterizes the work of one who might justly be described as a modern " master of those who know."

A last word upon the subject of his prose style. Clarity and charm—qualities which we have already ascribed to it—may on occasion blind the reader to a fundamental poverty of thought. Expounded in a prose less graceful and hypnotic, less animated by "lyricisme de la pensée," the "philosophy" of Santayana might not be found to cut much of a figure, though it is adapted perfectly to such an evocative work as the author's recent autobiography. Without committing ourselves to any particular theory of the relation between thought and expression, we may say that A. E. Taylor's style *keeps pace* with the movement of his thought, bends to its pressure, embodies in the most satisfying manner its logic. Such writing, which must be drunk in large draughts to be appreciated, has become properly transparent to thought, not in the sense that the bones or anatomy obtrude through it, but rather in the sense that the movement of word and phrase is a continual revelation or illumination, a continual self-effacement before the object. In so much expository prose, the sense leaks out only at intervals, with periods of blur and sometimes black-out; a good deal depends upon a technique of hit-and-miss, and the language strains and starts accordingly. The scrupulous precision of the *Elements of Metaphysics* becomes a rich and noble instrument in *The Faith of a Moralist*, seeming not merely to rise to the level of the more elevated theme but to state the theme itself. With the exception of Hegel and Kant, the great philosophers have usually been masters of language. Time alone will place A. E. Taylor's work in its due position; but we may be sure in advance that it will occupy one of distinction.

E. W. F. Tomlin.

Chorley Wood.

[1] A small but extremely well-argued book entitled *Does God Exist?* was published shortly before his death (It is reviewed on p. 89 *infra*.—Ed. Theology.)

Prison

(Tegel, Early Summer, 1944)

By PASTOR DIETRICH BONHOEFFER[1]

(*Translated by* J. B. LEISHMAN)

Outstretched upon my mattress,
I stare where gray walls stand.
Outside a summer evening that does not know me
goes singing into the land.
Slowly and softly
the tide of day is ebbing
on the eternal strand.
Sleep a little,
strengthen body and soul, strengthen head and hand,
for peoples, houses, hearts and spirits
in flames now stand.
Sleep a little,
gather strength, anger and courage,
let not your stream run wasting in trivial sand.
Till after the blood-red night your dawn arises,
still withstand !

Night and silence.
I listen.
Only the steps of guards and their voices calling,
hidden laughter of lovers distantly falling.
Idle sleeper, can you hear nothing besides?
I hear my own soul's heaving and tossing wave.
Nothing besides?
I hear, I hear,
like voices, like shouts,
like cries for planks that will save,
the dumb nocturnal thoughts of the waking, dreaming
companions suffering gave.
I hear beds' restless creaks and strains,
I hear chains.
I hear the sleepless tossing and stretching
of men whom longing for freedom and deeds of anger drives.
When sleep attains them at last in the grey fore-dawning,
dreamily they murmur of children and wives.
I hear the happy murmurs of half-grown boys,
finding in dreams some joys.

[1] Dietrich Bonhoeffer, who was one of the most promising leaders and theologians of the Confessional Church in Germany, was arrested by the Gestapo in April, 1943, and was murdered at the age of 39 by special order of Himmler at the concentration camp of Flossenburg on April 9, 1945, just before the Americans liberated the camp. Some of his books will be published in an English translation. He had been a lecturer in theology at the University of Berlin and also a pastor in Berlin and in London.

I hear them dragging their blankets round them,
to hide from hideous visions of gulfs that drowned them.
I hear the sighs and faint breathings of men grown grey,
silently getting ready to travel far away.
Justice and injustice they have seen both come and go,
and now some eternal, unforgettable thing they would gladly
know.
Night and silence
Only the steps and calls of the guards.
Can you hear in the silent house
that quivering preparation, that crackle amazing
of hundreds setting the kindled spark of their hearts ablazing?

Muted their choir,
wide-open my ear:
"We the old, we the young,
we of every tongue,
we the strong, we the weak,
we awake, we asleep,
we the poor, we the rich,
unfortunate each,
we the good, we the bad,
we that are what we are,
we men of many a scar,
we witnesses for those now afar,
we contumacious and we bemused,
we innocent and we gravely accused,
we by long loneliness deeply abused:
Brother, we seek you, we call you thus.
Brother, can you hear us?"

Twelve cold, thin strokes of the clock in the tower awaken me.
No sound, no warmth within them
to shelter have taken me.
Bayings of savage dogs at the midnight hour
have shaken me.
Poor sounds of sorrow
part from a poor to-day
a poor to-morrow.
That yet one day to another should wend,
which to nothing newer and better shall tend
than at last, like this one, to come to an end,—
what is that to me?
I would see the passing of time into time,
when flaming signs night's sky shall climb
and new bells over the peoples chime
out ringingly.
I wait, I wait for that midnight
within whose fiercely resplendent light
the wicked in fear shall cease to be,
and the good remain in felicity.

Creatures of night,
advance into the light.
Treachery, deceit,
approach the judgment-seat.
Mark, man, the sight
of sacred Might
establishing the Right.
Proclaim in wild delight
Justice and Truth and Grace
to men of a new race.
Heaven, now reconcile
Earth's sons in peace, and smile
upon them for a while.
Earth, bring forth bounteously!
Mankind, be free, be free!

I have suddenly sprung to my feet, excited
as though from the deck of a sinking ship I had sighted
land in the offing, as though there were something to hold,
as though I were gazing on ripening fruits of gold.
But wherever I glance, and grasp, and press
there is only the dark's impenetrable massiveness.
I sink into pondering,
I plunge down into the depths of the dark.
Night, where such outrage and evil are wandering,
to you will I hark.
How long shall our patience, and why, be by you consumed?
Silence for long unbroken:
then Night bends over me, and these words are spoken:
I am not dark, guilt only to darkness is doomed.

Guilt! I hear a trembling and quaking,
a murmur, a lamentation outbreaking,
hear anger within men's spirits rending.
In myriad voices mazily blending
a dumb choir
assails God's ear:
We, hunted by men and abused,
made defenceless and then accused,
unbearably burdened and losers
of all, we are yet the accusers.

We accuse all those who forced us to sinning,
who let us share in their guilty winning;
into witnessing of injustice surprised us,
and then as partners in guilt despised us.

Our eyes upon outrage had to gaze
until we were lost in guilt's dark maze;
then they locked our mouths up fast,
dumb as dogs we became at last.

We too had learned to lie before long,
and adapted ourselves to public wrong;
and when the defenceless were felled by force,
we took it all as a matter of course.

And what within our hearts still flamed
remained unspoken and unnamed;
we checked our blood's insurgent flow,
and trampled out the inward glow.

What sacredly had united men
was torn to tatters again and again;
friendship and loyalty were betrayed,
of tears and regrets a jest was made.

We, sons of many a sacred name
in the annals of Justice and Truth, became
despisers of God and of man as well,
and around us all was the laughter of Hell.

But now, with both freedom and honour denied,
before men we can hold up our heads in pride,
and if we are brought into evil fame,
we ourselves before men can clear our name.

Man against man, our ground we choose,
and we the accused will in turn accuse.

Before Thee only, all Being's Beginner,
Thee only, is each one of us a sinner.

With pain avoided, with deeds declined,
we have betrayed Thee before mankind.

We saw the Lie uplift its head,
and did not honour Truth instead.

By brothers oppressed we were greatly needed,
but danger of death was all we heeded.

As men we come before Thee,
to pardon our sins we implore Thee.

Lord, after days of fermentation,
grant us days of confirmation.

After so much going astray,
let us see the break of day.

Let us, far as eyes can see,
build ourselves a road to Thee.

Till our guilt through Thee shall cease,
keep us patiently at peace.

We in silence will prepare
till Thou call to days more fair,

till the storm and flood Thou still,
working wonders through Thy will.

Brother, till the night shall flee,
pray for me.

Earliest morning light creeps through my window, grey and pale,
gentle breezes round my forehead summer's breath exhale.
Summer day, sweet summer day, I murmur silently,
What will it bring for me?
Outside hastily muffled footsteps have broken that peace.
In my vicinity they suddenly cease.
I feel both hot and cold,
I know without being told.
A quiet voice lets something fall,
cutting and cool.
You'll soon have done with it, brother, brother, be bold.
Soon, soon. I hear you striding proudly, courageously.
No longer the present is what you look on, but days that are yet to be.
I go along with you, brother, to that place of fear,
and your last words I can hear:
"Brother, if this be the last dawn I shall see,
live for me!"

Outstretched upon my mattress,
I stare where grey walls stand.
Outside goes a summer morning,
not yet ours,
exulting into the land.
Brother, till after the long night
our dawn arises,
let us withstand.

Studies in Texts

A NOTE ON LUKE VII, 36-50

The passage as it stands is full of difficulty. The narrative of the anointing teaches that a repentant sinner who was full of love was forgiven much. The parable of the debtors teaches that he to whom much is forgiven will love much. Ver. 47 represents an illogical attempt to reconcile these two distinct points. The host's action in refusing ordinary hospitality is incomprehensible and irrelevant. That Jesus should call attention to it is also unnatural.

The passage up to v. 39 inclusive contains no difficulty. Affinities in detail (see commentaries) exist between it and Mark xiv, 3-9 (Matt. xxvi, 6-13), and between it and John xii, 1-8. As far as it goes, the linguistic evidence in this passage confirms a primitive source. The unnatural number of participles in vv. 38, 39 suggests an attempt to avoid the parataxis of a Semitic source (*cf.* Luke x, 30-34).

The parable itself (vv. 40*b*-43) forms a coherent unity. But it does not fit its context. (Compare the Parable of the Good Samaritan, which does not strictly answer the question "And who is my neighbour?") Is there any context which a parable, addressed to one Simon and teaching that he to whom much has been forgiven will love much, would fit?

There is evidence of an early appearance of the Risen Lord to Simon Peter which is not described in the synoptic tradition. Paul (1 Cor. xv, 5) places it first of all the appearances. Luke (xxiv, 35) mentions it incidentally without explanation. John xxi describes at length an appearance predominantly to Peter. The historical value of this third passage cannot be relied upon. But in the light of the other evidence we can be confident that there was an appearance to Peter.

The evidence both of Paul and Luke, since they give us no clue as to the content of the appearance, cannot help us to establish a relation between the parable of the debtors and the appearance to Peter. John xxi, on the other hand, can and does. The principle whereby the actual words of Jesus are potentially the most authentic part of a doubtful tradition is particularly valid for this passage since Jesus' words contain the Semitic appellation "Simon, son of John." We may repeat that the point of the parable of the debtors is that he who has been forgiven most loves most. In John xxi Peter, who has been forgiven his denial by virtue of being vouchsafed an appearance, is repeatedly asked, "Lovest thou Me *more than these*?"

On the assumption that there was an appearance to Peter and the more tentative assumption that the parable of the debtors, out of place in its present context, was originally connected with that appearance, we may reconstruct a picture of the Risen Lord appearing to the conscience-stricken Peter. Some scholars have linked the miraculous draught of fishes (Luke v, 1-11, see Creed *ad loc.*) with this appearance to Peter. However that may be, the cry, "Depart from me, for I am a sinful man, O Lord," would be appropriate to Peter's feelings. It would be a natural, indeed typical, method of reassurance for Jesus to return to the familiar beloved method of teaching by parables. And it is possible that Jesus pressed home the point of the parable by some such words as are preserved in John xxi.

The assumption of the historicity of the appearance to Peter and its connexion with the parable of the debtors demands that we should meet two questions. Why was the appearance only incorporated explicitly in the synoptic tradition in Luke xxiv, 35? And how did the parable become detached and find its way into its present context?

Answers to these questions are inevitably conjectural. We may note that in their Resurrection narratives Matthew and Luke are largely dependent on Mark. At the abrupt ending of Mark Matthew appears to have no further reliable tradition. Luke embarks on the beautifully constructed story of the journey to Emmaus, whose present form gives us little basis for connexion with a primitive source. It is therefore *prima facie* natural that Resurrection narratives which are absent in Mark may well be absent in the other synoptics and yet still be historical. And the absence of the appearance from Mark may be

ultimately due to the conscious effacement of Peter in that gospel. (See Rawlinson, *St Mark*, p. 28; also Newton Flew, *Jesus and His Church*, pp. 89 *ff.* If the latter's defence of the authenticity of Matt. xvi, 17 *ff.* is valid we have further evidence by contrast of the effacement of Peter in Mark.) A refusal or inability by Peter to record his wonderful and personal experience of the Risen Christ would account both for the abrupt ending of Mark and for the loss of the tradition to the synoptics except in its baldest form. It is in accordance with the evidence of 1 Cor. xv, 5 and Luke xxiv, 35 that the assumed appearance to Peter took place approximately at the point where Mark breaks off. Whether that be the explanation of that break or not, the break itself is sufficient to explain how the appearance has not been preserved more adequately in the synoptics.

In answer to the second question, we may note that the reasons whereby Peter might not wish to record his experience would not apply to the parable by itself. It might reasonably have found its way from Peter's lips into the Cæsarean or another local tradition, thence to be picked out by Luke's keen eye for parables as a "floating" saying. Elsewhere (Luke xiv) Luke incorporates "floating" material into a banquet scene. And we have noticed that the parable has a connexion, though an illogical one, with the thought behind the anointing. Finally, the parable is addressed to Simon; the story which Luke in part follows (Mark xiv, 3-9) takes place in the house of a certain Simon.

In conclusion it must be admitted that the conjectural relation between the parable of the debtors and the appearance to Peter rests on whether it is intrinsically probable that Jesus would speak a parable on such an occasion. We may note that in contrast to the general run of theophanies the Resurrection appearances as they occur in our meagre synoptic tradition are characterized by the simple and highly personal words and deeds by which Jesus reveals Himself (Matt. xxviii, 9, 10; Luke xxiv, 30 and 36-43). They are also characterized by teaching (Matt. xxviii, 18-20; Luke xxiv, 25 and 44-49).

A. H. Dammers.

Pembroke College,
Cambridge.

CORRESPONDENCE

"THE BISHOP AND HIS CHURCH"

To the Editor of Theology.

Dear Sir,

I find Mr Bennett's stimulating article on "The Bishop and his Church" so various in its contents as almost to defy comment. I should like to enter a *caveat* against some of his historical arguments that the city-bishopric alone must be regarded as primitive and truly expressive of the mind of the early Church concerning the ideal of episcopacy; but I doubt whether he intends it as more than a sounding-board for the enunciation of his own ideas of present reform. Thus, whilst advocating "a return to more primitive arrangements" (than the contemporary large territorial diocese), he does so "not in any

antiquarian spirit, but for theological and administrative reasons"; again, he is not "primarily interested in reorganization, nor . . . recommending a slavish imitation of the primitive." Perhaps, therefore, it will be wiser to concentrate comment on his suggested reforms than on their historical precedents.

It may be agreed at the outset that we have not attained the ideal of episcopacy, and by so much our commendation of episcopacy to non-episcopal churches fails to convince. In particular, I should personally agree that episcopal government should be constitutional, and that so far as it is monarchical it must be a constitutional monarchy. I should go farther than Mr Bennett in one respect—namely, in desiring the laity to play a more active and less passive part in this constitutional régime in the Church. I agree cordially that Archbishop Ussher's scheme for the blending of episcopal and presbyteral elements has not received the attention it merited, either from contemporaries or modern reformers. Of course, a very constitutional episcopacy, with laity as well as clergy participating in its administration, prevails in the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States of America.

When one comes down to practical proposals I find it much more difficult to see what pattern of reform Mr Bennett advocates. In general I take it that he wants more and therefore smaller dioceses; though he modifies this by stating that some of his suggestions may be "mere romantic notions," and that "there should be no attempt at a cut-and-dried pattern." I am not clear how far these reservations are loopholes for the retention of the large diocese, and for the return of the "figure in the world," which, if he denies it to bishops, he seems to wish to give to their sees, since "the dignity which will accrue to a see from its association with a place of secular importance is not to be despised." Coming to his principles, I should like a fuller definition of the concept of the bishop as "the father of a family." Families have a habit of growing up and claiming a very considerable latitude of action; so that the paternal functions of the bishop may conceivably be exercised by not interfering too closely in the parochial work of his clergy. The bishop must be a father, not a fussy governess. In Bishop Hensley Henson's *Retrospect of an Unimportant Life*, there is the important statement (ii. 93) that "Bishop Browne told me that when he was Bishop of Bristol he found the see too small to provide him with an adequate sphere of work. The Bishop of Wakefield speaks to the same effect about his see." It is surely undesirable to multiply dioceses of this kind. Moreover, in the point on which Mr Bennett lays most emphasis, the leadership of the bishop in the liturgical worship of his church, the modern acceleration of means of transport surely makes the realization of this ideal more possible in a large territorial diocese than in any previous age of the church. Cannot the bishop arrive by motor-car in time for the Family Eucharist at 9 a.m.? I am not sure whether Mr Bennett does not argue on contradictory lines by asserting that "the larger regionalism which modern transport has brought into operation" points towards the extension of the parochial unit but towards the contraction of the diocese.

Mr Bennett, in his third principle, recognizes the position of the

bishop as "the guardian and expounder of sound doctrine." It may be permissible to suggest the doubt whether the evidence of history tells in favour of the small bishopric in this vital matter. Dr E. W. Watson wrote that "in the great age of dogmatic controversies, the fourth and fifth centuries, the multitude of insignificant bishops, easily led or misled, was a disaster to the Church. The contrast between them and the great bishops, who were steadied by the responsibility of occupying important sees, is striking." The same contrast found expression in the most recent Roman council, that of the Vatican of 1870, where the multitude of bishops of small sees were more prominent by the counting of their heads in voting than the exercise of them in thinking. Does Mr Bennett envisage as part of his reforms the restriction of the prerogative of participating in episcopal councils concerned with theological definitions to those bishops who occupy his "few episcopal thrones which . . . could have something of the nature of professorial chairs"? Unless episcopal pronouncements merit attention by the learning and soundness of their contents, they will not command it by being issued by 430 instead of 43 English diocesan bishops.

Moreover, something should be said of the position of the inferior clergy in the small circle of the reduced episcopal familia. Mr Bennett does not intimate whether he is in favour of primitive custom by restricting the clergy to life service in the diocese of their ordination. Certainly in some present English dioceses their smallness presents bishops with almost insuperable obstacles to providing variety of parishes, and in particular to furnishing spheres of work for incumbents who need a change from the large industrial towns. Will not the multiplication of small sees aggravate the immobility of the clergy and the difficulties of a change of parish?

There are various other points which might be mentioned if space permitted. Mr Bennett is so enamoured of the metaphor of the father of the family that he would effect a drastic purge of all the "in-laws" such as uncles. I am not so sure that bishops suffragan and archdeacons may be so easily dismissed. But I write this letter mainly in the hope of inducing Mr Bennett to develop his theme by being precise and detailed as to the transformation which he wishes to effect in the two Provinces of Canterbury and York. Will he not offer us a blueprint of the new provinces and dioceses which form part of his scheme? Then we can judge more clearly and adequately of the respective merits of the present order and his new order. His article leaves me with confusion rather than clarity as to the respective degrees to which he proposes, on the one hand, "to appeal to antiquity," and, on the other hand, to "talk about development."

Yours, etc.,
NORMAN SYKES.

CAMBRIDGE.

Mr Bennett writes as follows:

In writing my article I was assuming that the present order cannot survive. I expect it to be modified almost beyond recognition by force of circumstances in a matter of decades. It is not necessary to give reasons for this expectation, since these have been so clearly set forth

in the Editorial of the issue of THEOLOGY in which my article appeared. I agree with the Editor that change probably will and perhaps must await the pressure of necessity. But that is not to say that we should be content with mere hasty improvisation as necessity arises, nor need we be driven to make do with the sad relics of a system which already fails to correspond either to our own condition or to the demands of the times. In writing of a larger regionalism I was foreseeing a state of affairs in which the diocese would have to take over much that has been done by the parish, and for that purpose smaller dioceses would be more effective. If in my article I looked back, it was in the hope of provoking historians less amateur than myself into producing guiding principles from the past. If I look forward, it can only be in an attempt to open up such undetailed discussion of the future as is possible, before the deluge comes. My mapping pen shall remain in his place.

But I must hasten to add that the words "mere romantic notions" were intended to apply only to the passage in which they occur and to which, I think, they evidently belong. I was far from desiring to leave any loophole for returning prelacy, since I do not think that prelacy will tend to the building up of the Body of Christ, and again I agree with the Editor that this must always be our primary objective —and most of all now. Better a fussy parent than one so busy that he has unduly to commit the care and nurture of his children to a governess or other suffragan. In speaking of the bishop as a father, I did but follow the Ordinal, and I think that few of us would wish the archdeacon or his deputy to address him as "My lord." But, indeed, the pale shadow of the medieval set-up dates. A world which was inclined to be impressed by bishops may have been awestruck by their rarity, but, be it whispered, this is not such a world, and one may doubt whether the real weight of episcopal utterance will be in proportion to the acreage of the diocese.

But now, lest I seem to be asking for too much space even in the 32-page THEOLOGY which we rejoice to see, I must confine myself to brief observations, whose brevity will not, I hope, be interpreted as abruptness. (1) The episcopal car will indeed carry the bishop far afield by 9 a.m., but nobody has yet devised a method of episcopal fission, and I do not think that we should desire him to dash from eucharist to eucharist. (2) I certainly should not be prepared to entrust the "professorial" sees with a monopoly of theological definition. (3) A system which made possible a closer acquaintance on the part of the bishop with incumbents and parishes might well result in greater diocesan and interdiocesan clerical mobility. (4) Professor Sykes is favourable to Archbishop Ussher's scheme, but how can synodical government be effective in a diocese in which the synod assumes the proportions of a mass meeting? (5) Neither Nestorius of Constantinople nor Dioscorus of Alexandria appears to have been steadied by his occupancy of an important see. (6) Was it not the location rather than the existence of small sees which (in so far as it was a factor) produced yes-men at the Vatican Council? (7) As to the remarks of Bishop Browne and the late Bishop of Wakefield, respect for dignities forbids me to express my outraged pastoral feelings.

THE WEEK-DAY LECTIONARY

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

In view of the fact that the proposed revision of the Week-day Lectionary is in abeyance, may I make some suggestions with regard to a future revision?

A Week-day Lectionary should be of practical use to the laity as well as to the clergy, therefore the lessons should be of such a length, and arranged in such a way, that they may be used singly if so desired. Laymen would prefer to read their daily "portion" *with the Church*, rather than follow one of the various readings offered unofficially.

1. The Lectionary should be spread over two years, to be called "odd" and "even" years, as the case may be. This will enable the lessons to be much shorter.

2. The first half of the Old Testament to be read in the mornings and the second half in the evenings. This will give variety to those who read both lessons and enable one who can read only one lesson a day to read through the Old Testament in four years.

3. The New Testament to be read through once in the morning and once in the evening each year. The shorter lesson will encourage the younger people to read one lesson a day, *with the Church*.

Such a rearrangement would, I believe, be welcomed by all.

Yours faithfully,

P. F. H. HOW.

RUNWELL HOSPITAL,
NEAR WICKFORD, ESSEX.

BOOK REVIEWS

RELIGION IN AMERICA. By Willard L. Sperry. Cambridge University Press. 10s. 6d.

CHURCH, COLLEGE, AND NATION. By G. R. Elliott. The Cloister Press, Louisville, Kentucky. $1.50.

These two books give an all-round view of an aspect of American life which is very much more important than Britishers realize, and the future direction of which will probably determine the orientation of American thought and action during the remainder of the century. The Church still plays a large part in the average American home, and Dr Sperry's book presents an accurate picture of the interstices of this relationship. Dr Elliott's book, written specially for American undergraduates and "college" teachers, is a presentation of the pathetic state of Christianity in the American university or college and a powerful appeal for its revivification.

Religion in America is the first volume in an "American Life and Institutions" series which the Cambridge University Press is bringing out. Certainly, in spite of the author's deliberate informality of style, this book maintains the high traditions of the "Scholar's Press" and is an admirable introduction to American life.

Even to-day, as Dr Sperry, who is Dean of the Divinity School at Harvard University, brings out, the Church influences greatly the life

of the average American. However, this influence is often concerned merely with the social, even as regards the Sunday morning service. Some readers may have seen the account, in *Life* or elsewhere, of President Truman's visit last September to a Missouri State fair that he had not missed for twelve years. Important items in his program were buffet suppers at the Methodist and Baptist churches.

Dr Sperry's book is an accurate and unbiased account of the history and present condition of religion in America. Although naturally he is primarily concerned with Protestant Christianity, he considers the position of the Roman Church at some length, and reference is also made to the Mormon Church, Christian Science, various bodies like Jehovah's Witnesses, and the eclectic religious bodies that find themselves specially at home in Southern California.

What the book makes clear is that one cannot understand America and Americans without studying their religious traditions, and that few Englishmen know anything about these. One might say that Americans advertise all their institutions abroad, particularly through the cinema, except their religion. And when religion does appear on the screen it is usually Roman Catholic rather than Protestant; although the figures of "church" membership are 23,000,000 Roman Catholics, 4,600,000 Jews, 1,200,000 Eastern Orthodox and 38,500,000 Protestants. The reason why the American screen has generally avoided Protestant religion may be the Protestant lack of the sacramental and the "colourful"—apart from revival meetings, which are now largely a thing of the past. Dr Sperry points out that the Protestant Churches—except the American Episcopal (Anglican), which has maintained Catholic tradition and so been generally considered aloof and obscurantist—are now feeling this lack of the ceremonial and sacramental and are trying, often clumsily, to use both in order to clothe the bare bones of their Puritan inheritance.

As regards the future of the Church in America Dr Sperry is not discouraging. Despite its past tendency to worldliness it has remained a vital spiritual influence. Between 1918 and 1941 the churches began to be really awakened to the highly problematic world in which they were living. "There was much self-criticism, a strong desire to get together . . . our churches were better in the 1930's than they were in the 1900's . . . our churches seem to be gaining ground rather than losing."

Dr Elliott's book concentrates on a small portion of the enormous field covered by Dr Sperry. He is Professor of English at Amherst College and, himself a convert from atheism, he believes the future of Christianity in America will be decided within its university and college walls. He is particularly concerned with the scorn and contempt still poured on religion in the average American college, and with the moral cowardice of those members of the "faculty" who do hold some sort of belief but do not join battle with "the enemy."

This small book is an eloquent and convincing plea for the renascence of religion in American higher education as the only way of returning to what is best in American tradition.

H. B. Richardson.

New Delhi.

Reinhold Niebuhr: Prophet from America. By D. R. Davies. James Clarke and Co. 4s. 6d.

There was need for an introduction to the work of Dr Niebuhr. There are many persons academically qualified in theology who cannot understand his main positions, probably because they cannot believe that a Christian can say what Dr Niebuhr apparently does say, and infer that he must be trying to say something else, and failing.

Mr Davies starts at the right place—with the formative influence of the years spent as minister of a church in Detroit, and in addition has the advantage of having experienced an intellectual development not unlike Dr Niebuhr's, and so of knowing something of what it *feels* like to be Reinhold Niebuhr; and he includes some biographical information not elsewhere available. The bulk of the book is occupied with exposition of the "dialectical" character of Dr Niebuhr's thought; with his development to the theological right and political left of American Liberal Protestantism; and with the understanding of Christianity as a "permanent revolution."

Theologians will not expect in ninety-four pages a summary of the Gifford Lectures, still less a critique of them. (For the latter they may refer to Dr Demant's review in these pages.) Others have one or two minor causes for complaint. For example, we are urged to begin our study of Dr Niebuhr with *Leaves from the Notebook of a Tamed Cynic*, which is almost unobtainable in this country; and the English publishers of *An Interpretation of Christian Ethics*, the S.C.M. Press, might well have been given.

A major criticism applies to the whole series of "Modern Christian Revolutionaries," of which this is one title. What is meant by calling Dr Niebuhr a "revolutionary"? The "Christian revolution" can hardly be like the Marxist, a thoroughgoing attack on existing institutions, for Dr Niebuhr (like the author and the reviewer) makes his living off Christian institutions which are parts of the existing social order. Ought we then to raise false hopes or appeal to naïve expectations by suggesting the opposite?

The phrase "the theory of the permanent revolution" neatly summarizes one aspect of Dr Niebuhr's attitude to all historical achievement. But on his own showing the successful revolution derives its dynamic from a myth—*e.g.*, that the revolution will bring in the classless society. Dr Niebuhr's Christian convictions preclude this simple faith and the single-minded passion it generates. He himself gives a good deal of his spare time to political affairs, and does not forget them when he theologizes. If he had chosen to be a full-time politician, the configuration of American politics might be different. But he chose to be a theologian.

David Paton.

Westcott House,
Cambridge.

The Teaching of the Bible. By Bede Frost. Mowbrays. 5s.

The situation created by the Education Act is so complex that light from any quarter is welcome. Scripture is now the one compulsory

subject in State schools, and the teaching of it is in the hands of laymen who may be fully trained, partly trained or untrained, and who may or may not be living members of the Church. For the most part—and this might well be noted by churchmen—teachers are extraordinarily conscientious about the subject. If they sometimes bring to it an outmoded rationalism, that is hardly surprising, since an outmoded rationalism is the air we have all been breathing for years; and if they are bewildered by their ignorance or by the turmoil of biblical criticism, that also is not surprising, since many devoted churchmen share the same bewilderment. Now and then one meets anticlericalism, but even here the Church is not without responsibility: scratch an anticlerical and you will not infrequently find a teacher who has been clumsily handled by an insensitive or arrogant clergyman. In this state of affairs it surely behoves churchmen who write to instruct teachers on the use of the Bible to do so with patience, sympathy and circumspection. An excellent model is Prof. Tasker's lectures for clergy and teachers, *The Nature and Purpose of the Gospels*. The principal defect of Fr Bede Frost's book is its constant note of irritation. The asperity with which, in his previous works, he has castigated modern heresies is out of place here, and very few of those who do not already share his somewhat rigid view of the Bible are likely to get beyond the opening chapter with its string of stories illustrating the stupid errors made by teachers and pupils alike. (These stories of the type "Please, Miss, how can you give us a Scripture lesson when nobody in the class believes in God?" are now "chestnuts" and might well be dropped in any serious discussion of the matter.) There are good things in the book, notably on the Canon and the Wisdom literature. The author is strong, as one would expect, on the Bible as the Church's possession, and correspondingly weak on the Bible as the Church's criterion and judge. The relation between Church and Bible is a two-way, not a one-way, traffic. Little help is given on the proper use of criticism, though there are frequent jibes at the critics, and it is, to say the least, misleading to cite no other example of criticism combined with orthodoxy than Dr Kissane's commentary on Isaiah. In chapter vii, which has since been published as a separate pamphlet, the author has collected together under twenty headings passages from all parts of the Bible which illustrate the main dogmas of the Christian faith. Although it leaves the impression of the Bible as a "flat" book, of uniform importance in all its parts, this collection might be useful for certain purposes. It is not, however, what the teacher needs, for the teacher has to tell the Bible stories, and the book which will help him most is the book which relates the several stories to the main theme of revelation so that the doctrine may emerge in the telling of the story.

C. F. Evans,
Lincoln Training College.

This Service. By Albert Mitchell. The Church Book Boom. 10s.

Handbook to the Christian Liturgy. By James Norman. S.P.C.K. 10s. 6d.

These two books are both liturgical notebooks, compiled by their authors perhaps first for themselves and then found to be of interest to others.

Mr Albert Mitchell is a member of the Church Assembly. His work is subtitled "Notes on the Order of Holy Communion according to the use of the Church of England; with introduction; and appendices." He is a devout layman of Low Church principles, who in 1936 published a book on the English Bible. In this companion piece on the English Prayer Book he again displays considerable erudition, and is full of praise, too full of praise, for the craftsmanship of the Book of Common Prayer. He is acquainted with a good deal of the liturgical literature of the turn of the century. It is perhaps going too far to speak with such reverence of J. T. Tomlinson—"one of our most learned liturgiologists" (p. 69), though he be an able and valiant defender of Low Church principles. Well, here is an interesting collection of notes on the text of the Prayer Book rite. The matter in them is not only historical and antiquarian, but a careful recording of the usages and views of a definite if dwindling school of thought within the Church. Commenting on the fair white linen cloth of the fourth initial rubric he says: "It should be draped over the Table, and is not sufficiently represented by a mere slip, invisible to those in the body of the church. 'At the Communion time' governs this direction also, and excludes leaving the cloth on from day to day" (p. 39). For those who have lived in other traditions, this is one of the chief interests of this book, and in the future it may be valued for these very photographings of such practices.

The second book is far less a dilettante affair. Its author is an Australian archdeacon, but it would grace the reputation of a begaitered one in this island. Its concern is the Eucharist of the Catholic Church, the ancient Eucharist of the so-called historical Churches. Part I rapidly depicts the growth and expansion of the Eucharistic rite and characterizes its many regional varieties. Part II goes through the Liturgy step by step, declaring what is made of it in different rites and places. This is probably the more valuable part of the book. This way of handling matters creates the impression that all those rites are more closely akin and of a piece than is indeed the fact. A student also needs to go through each liturgy on its own to realize how these various elements weave together to form that liturgy, how they are used to express the special insights and proportions of that particular rite. But this examination of the "bricks" out of which the old liturgical temples were constructed has its uses. Those who are green in liturgical science will find it of use in mastering the technical abracadabra of liturgists. Those more browned off will value it as a reference book when at work on Brightman's *Eastern Liturgies* or musing on some part or ceremony of the Eucharist. It can even be recommended as a bedside book to those who like something pithy with

which to gather up their thoughts within them as they set forth to keep vigil with those *requiescentes in pace*.

R. P. Symonds.

Crowland.

Does God Exist? By A. E. Taylor. Macmillan. 7s. 6d.

A little (scientific) knowledge is a dangerous thing. What is to be done about the increasing mass of intelligent people for whom education means technical education? The Conversion Report *inter alia* calls for cheap literature to counter the influence of (*e.g.*) the Thinkers' Library. Clearly there is a need for a good cheap book designed explicitly to expose the bad metaphysical assumptions of anti-metaphysical agnostics, the phrases pregnant with false meaning which constantly figure in "popular science." God is in danger of steadily receding from the minds of our half-educated technicians, like the Cheshire cat in *Alice*, until only a faint cosmic smile remains (to use a favourite phrase of Mr Julian Huxley). To meet this need is the explicit aim of the essay under review. "My purpose is not to *demonstrate* the being of God, but only to argue that some alleged and widely entertained 'scientific' objections to theistic belief are unsound" (Preface).

Prof. Taylor begins by arguing the dilemma between the admission of the necessity of metaphysics for science and an ultra-Humean scepticism about the claims of science itself. We are then given a somewhat discursive exposition of the Argument from Design (sect. IV), carefully related to the findings of modern biology. The Moral Argument follows, clearly and forcibly set out. The last section of the book is devoted to the alleged incredibility for scientific minds of the historical facts of the Christian religion. The acceptance of any "proved" certainties may be shown to involve the acceptance of others which are not provable (pp. 130-140). It is then argued at length that if belief in God and His redemptive purpose is presupposed the stigma of irrationality cannot be put upon the Resurrection, the Virgin Birth or the Second Coming.

Ordinands and many others will be glad to find within 170 pages a case for theism which is comprehensive, sound, and relevant to contemporary needs. It is a pity that an immense amount of good illustrative material, which would be better in the text, is tucked away in unwieldy footnotes. A more serious matter is that the price of the book is too high for its purpose. For one copy at 7s. 6d. ten would sell in paper backs at a florin. Moreover, even "Pelican" books usually have an index. This book has neither index nor synopsis of contents nor even chapter-headings, a deficiency which is inexcusable. A new and cheaper edition, provided perhaps with a short notice of the author in addition to the essential helps just mentioned, would be a more fitting *opus ultimum* of a distinguished Christian philosopher.

B. S. Moss.

Scholæ Cancellarii,
Lincoln.

Reasoning Faith. By T. C. Hammond. The Inter-Varsity Fellowship. 5s.

This is a textbook of apologetics, a subject which is regarded with disfavour in certain theological circles to-day. Yet in spite of this attitude a case can still be made out for the attempt to defend Christianity against the intellectual prejudices of the age, and apologetics is a study with a long and respectable history in Christian thought. It may be true that unbelief is seldom the result of genuine intellectual doubt, yet the task of breaking down the prejudices which modern thought has planted in the minds of our contemporaries is one which the theologian cannot afford to neglect.

Canon Hammond divides his book into three parts. In the first part he addresses himself to the philosophic difficulties which stand in the way of the acceptance of a theistic view of the universe. His discussion is largely epistemological, and he labours, I think successfully, to show that, if man must be regarded as a part of nature, his understanding of the universe shows that man also transcends nature in his comprehension of it. By refuting materialism in this way, the author makes it possible to appreciate the relevance of the theistic position.

The second part of the book deals with scientific problems and is almost entirely taken up with a discussion of the theory of evolution. The author amasses an enormous amount of detailed information to prove that, while the theory of evolution may be regarded as a description of the way in which the world has arrived at its present state of development, it does not explain to us how or why this development has taken place. For such an explanation we must look beyond the process of evolution itself to the Intelligence which controls and guides the development of the universe for His own purpose.

Part three of this book is historical and deals mainly with the gospel evidence for the revelation given in Jesus Christ. The point is carefully made that the gospels can only be adequately explained if they are regarded as accounts of facts which actually did happen in the historical sphere. Canon Hammond is inclined to be sceptical about a good deal of the modern discussion of gospel origins, and even if he has not said the last word on the subject his analysis of it will serve as a good antidote for those who have suffered from an overdose of Q, M, and L.

J. H. Jacques.

Pentrobin.

SHORTER NOTICES

The State and Ourselves Tomorrow. By C. R. Cook. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

This book, which is published in "The Christian Looks Ahead Series," contains in a compact and readable form much information about how Britain is governed. It is information with which all citizens would do well to be acquainted. Mr Cook does not only look ahead; he looks back and traces the changes that have taken place in

the British State since the industrial revolution. If he had paid some attention to the teaching of Coleridge his final chapter on "The State and the Good Life" might not have been quite so thin.

Mr Cook is an earnest and competent exponent of Beveridgism. He propounds the case for the social service State convincingly; but he dismisses too airily the apprehension that the social service State may become the servile State. He does not deal with the relation of the State to education, but this may be because the subject is being dealt with in another book in the series. It may seem strange too that a Christian looking ahead has nothing to say about the relation of the State to the Church. This omission gives rise to misgivings, since Mr Cook uses strong language about the "unique and ultimate duties and rights" of the State. In his final chapter he cites Archbishop William Temple, but he does not seem to have assimilated Temple's teaching. This is illustrated by the fact that he changes Temple's emphasis on the *personal* into an emphasis on the *individual*, without apparently noticing the difference.

While the Christian looking ahead to the future of the State ought certainly to take into account all the facts and probabilities which this book sets forth, there are many other things that he ought to take into account as well.

A. R. V.

The Christian Family and the Servile State. By J. Clifford Gill. Staples Press. 2s.

There will soon be more books about the family than families. Nevertheless, this book is to be welcomed, since it places the family in its fundamental and God-given setting. We could wish that it might be studied by, among others, those who speak at Mothers' Union meetings. For it should surely be the primary objective of that organization to create an informed body of Christian opinion whose championship of the family is founded upon something less precarious than sentiment. But indeed this is a task for the whole Church. The insidious by-passing and undermining of the authority and responsibility of the home will not meet with due resistance until it is far more generally understood among Christians how much is at stake. Mr Gill's book should prove a useful means of disseminating such understanding. It is perhaps a pity that he has risked drawing the red herring of the Social Dividend across his own trail. Not that Christians should be afraid to call the bluff of orthodox finance, but one fears that this may distract attention from the important things which he has to say on less provocative subjects. Incidentally, the format of the book is one which might well be more widely employed in Christian apologetics. It is neither a tract nor a tome.

Frank Bennett.

Neston-in-Wirral.

The Christian Congregation. William Ainslie Memorial Lecture, 1945. By Lord Eustace Percy. Longmans. 1s.

The Family Service. By J. M. Nicholson. (About the Parish Communion, No. 1.) S.P.C.K. 2d.

The Worshipping Community. Officers' Study Scheme, Federation of University Women's Camps for Schoolgirls.

The revival of biblical theology; the final rout of Hooker's comfortable doctrine of Church and State; the thirst for some answer to the problem of the relations between individual and community which should avoid both anarchy and regimentation: on the human side, these are probably the factors which have contributed most to the rehabilitation of the local congregation in Christian thought and practice.

In the William Ainslie Memorial Lecture for 1945, one who is in the aristocratic tradition of the Humanities (in Pauline phraseology, both "noble" and "wise according to the flesh") yet speaks strongly of the ordinary Christian congregation's distinctive contribution to the life of the world to-day. The essentially corporate nature of the Christian ethical witness, its utter dependence on faith and hope, and the characteristically personal fruits of its works—all these are here, and in no uncertain terms.

There are points at which one would have to enter caveats. Acts xvii is usually looked upon as St Paul's sole—and unsuccessful—venture, not into eschatology, but into natural theology! "Simple kindliness," just like that, is probably rather less than an adequate version of the criterion of the Judgment in Matt. xxv; while leaven is more often than not a "bad thing" in the New Testament.

Nevertheless, we should be very happy at this utterance of Lord Eustace Percy's. The gulf between academic and parish life has often been both great and hurtful; his lecture shows that one scholar, at least, is willing to take his place with the little ones of the flock.

Mr Nicholson restates simply and realistically (witness especially his remarks on children) the now familiar arguments for the "Parish Communion." He has not attempted to deal with some important questions which the many pamphleteers in this field have left unanswered. For instance, how can we carry over into our Parish Communions that solid "pattern of sainthood" which the 8-11-6.30 tradition unquestionably has produced? We need solidity in these flimsy days, and it is rather doubtful whether a diet of the Word consisting only of Epistle, Gospel and "liturgical sermon" can secure it. Perhaps another writer in this series will help us with such difficulties as these.

The F.U.W.C.S. Officers' Study scheme for 1945 covers an immense field—on the whole, successfully. While the biblical section is excellent, some of the questions in Part Ic are rather of the "Have you stopped beating your wife?" variety. The efforts to be fair to "high" sacramental doctrine, gallantly ecumenical though they are, show signs of strain.

JOHN MONTAGUE.

LIVERPOOL.

Episcopi Vagantes in Church History. By A. J. Macdonald. S.P.C.K. 1s.

A reprint of this essay, which originally appeared in the *Church Quarterly Review*, is very welcome. The subject is an obscure one, but not without present interest, since the number of *episcopi vagantes* who to-day trouble the ecclesiastical authorities is probably as great as at any time in history.

Dr Macdonald is concerned with the earlier history of episcopal wandering and he traces the habit to various causes. Challenging the conclusions of Mabillon and Thomassin, he finds the primary cause of vagrantism in the East, not the ambitions of the *chorepiscopi*, but deprivation of jurisdiction, though not of episcopal status, for heresy or misconduct. A further contributory factor was the method of popular election whereby a bishop might be consecrated for a see which later refused to elect him, thus compelling him to wander in order to seek a livelihood. (It may be noted that a somewhat similar case occurred in 1866 when the Archbishop of Canterbury consecrated Mr Jenner for the see of Dunedin, which subsequently refused to elect him.)

In the West the *chorepiscopi* were a more fruitful source of *vagabundi*, while the Irish missionary bishops wandered over Europe until the ninth century. A later cause of vagrancy was the doubtful status of the bishops *in partibus infidelium* who remained at any rate a potential source of trouble until a decree of Propaganda in 1882 regularized their status. Occasionally *episcopi vagantes* were encouraged by the diocesan prelates who maintained a number of them to enhance the prestige of their sees.

Dr Macdonald's careful inquiry has shown that the number of strange-titled prelates who at present trouble our peace are by no means an isolated phenomenon but that, in some form or other, their roots strike deep into the past and all through the centuries legislation has been levelled against them. But whereas, in the majority of cases, the objection to the historic *vagans* was that his wandering habits disturbed diocesan administration, to-day the prelates wander less and the ground of objection against them is that their episcopal status is in most cases doubtful. Dr Macdonald has not carried his inquiry into the nineteenth century, but he has provided a background for which investigators of the episcopal underworld of that period must be deeply grateful.

HENRY R. T. BRANDRETH, O.G.S.

NORTHOLT PARK.

The Land, the People and the Churches. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

This is about the changing countryside, religion and the life of the Churches, and the Church and the community. It was written by Mrs Bliss, over the answers to a series of questions directed to a number of specially constituted Village Groups by a group set up by the British Council of Churches. Its purpose is to call the Churches from undue concentration on urban problems, and there is little in country life over which it does not skim in 94 pages: painstaking and interesting.

Main criticisms are two. One—the report is neither a mass observa-

tion of rural opinion nor a survey of the rural scene, but a hotch-potch of both. Mass observation would reveal the spiritual forces livingly present: something to be dealt with. A survey presents an ideal to be incarnated thus and thus in a setting understood to be so and so: something to be debated. This book is a jumble of what is, what the countryman thinks about it, and what the group hope to do to both.

Two—the report declares that the Christian doctrine of creation needs restating: meaning that the needs of man as made by God call for a social order that sponsors humility, responsibility and creativeness. Then the question is—Will justice in the rural community best be served by striving after a self-supporting economy or by infusing the departments of the collective State with a good spirit? While the report states that it was the localness of the old order—place and neighbour—which made it apt for religion, now, it tells us, increasingly the countryman deals with officials he scarcely meets; farming will prosper if it marches with the times; the relation is between representatives of owners and men through the unions, *laus Deo*, on a business footing; the young want definite hours (heigh-ho for the swing of the year!); "social security" will restore the sense of vocation; neighbourliness depends on the use of leisure and the preservation in the state services of the element of personal service; in fact, p. 21: "Most of the differences between town and country in outward ways of living and in ways of thinking have been ironed out in this mass-producing age."

What is to be done? The report deplores the sprawl of houses but not that of megalopolitan culture; it praises the past but its vision for the future is lighted less by a doctrine of the creation than by paleotechnic ideology.

M. P. Ralph Bowman.

Ashbrittle.

Youth Service Handbook 1945-6. Edited by Dermot O'C. Grubb. W. Walker and Sons. 6s. 6d.

This Handbook is an almost indispensable source of information for all those who are in any way connected with the Service of Youth. Full details are given about Activities in and out of Club Premises, Equipment, Finance, National and Local Organizations, Club Leaders and Club Members. The Bibliography is extensive, and there is a short account of American Youth Organizations.

The Handbook contains details of Religious Youth Organizations, and information about religious drama and films. But, although there is a selected bibliography, religion (like social theory, social psychology, general psychology and educational theory) is omitted from it.

F. N. D.

The Next Three Years. By Reginald Lumb. Mowbrays. 1s. 3d.

Canon Lumb has already given us a book dealing with the religion of children under three. In this small volume he continues the discussion, dealing with young children aged from three to six. His

book is not a series of Sunday-school lessons or Bible stories; nor is it a syllabus. Canon Lumb regards the education of young children not so much as a matter of instruction as a matter of character. So his book takes the form of an account of how to build religion into the character of very young children. In this he breaks new ground and deals with a subject of profound importance. At no age is religious instruction sufficient by itself; nor is it sufficient to add to it the enthusiasm and spiritual devotion of the teacher. What is essential is that the child should catch something of that enthusiasm and spiritual devotion itself. The child needs to be taught religion and not merely to be given doses of religious instruction. In itself this is a task of extraordinary difficulty and it is rendered more so by the shyness and self-conscious reticence in matters of religion which is characteristic of our time. It is in this that Canon Lumb aims to help us. His approach is psychological throughout. Using McDougall's psychology of the instincts and emotions and Shand's account of the sentiments, he sets out to show how modern psychological methods can be used to plant a sound approach to religion firmly into the mind of the child.

The book ought to be of use to parents who are perplexed about the religious upbringing of their children, and teachers in the kindergarten departments of both day and Sunday schools should also find in it much that is useful.

J. H. Jacques.

Pentrobin.

The Wretchedness and Greatness of the Church. By W. A. Visser 't Hooft. S.C.M. Press. 2s. 6d.

The book has been born out of the conflict of the Church in Europe. The temporary triumph of German totalitarianism placed the Church "under the cross" in one country after another, and out of the suffering and persecution which followed, a new spiritual outlook and vitality have emerged. But this is not a book about persecution. The author takes that for granted. Persecution, he believes, is something which the Church must expect to endure as her Master endured it before her. The author's concern is not with persecution but with the fact that persecution has revealed that the easy life which the Church has led for so long has caused her almost to lose sight of her true vocation—her vocation to be the Church. Persecution has revealed how far the Church has fallen away and persecution has served to recall her to her destiny, the high destiny of being the people of God.

This book speaks with a conviction and a realism fashioned in adversity. Reading it, one is made aware of the gap which exists between the Church on the Continent and the Church in this more comfortable little island. There is much for us to learn from this message delivered to us in the name of our fellow-Christians in Europe who have discovered much from the bitter experience they have been forced to undergo.

J. H. Jacques.

Pentrobin.

Christ and Human Values. By W. H. Murray Walton. Lutterworth Press. 4s. 6d.

This book was inspired by the Malvern Conference on the Church and Social Reform, but the author does not set out to give us another analysis of the social evils of our time, nor a blueprint for a Christian New Order. Instead, he sets himself to the less ambitious task of describing the human values which can be regarded as being implied by the teaching of Jesus. These values, he considers, must be behind all our discussion of social problems. He gives us an account of such things as the sanctity of personality and the rights of the individual, of freedom, equality, community life, and wealth. The last chapter is an appeal for individual conversion as an essential prerequisite for a Christian Social Programme.

Although he has nothing new to say the author keeps his exposition close to the Gospels and the teaching of Jesus, and in this way manages to avoid an abstract presentation of his subject-matter. He writes clearly and pleasantly and his book will be read by many who find the writings of our leading Christian sociologists too difficult for them.

J. H. JACQUES.

PENTROBIN.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.*)

AMERICAN SOCIETY OF CHURCH HISTORY: B. M. Levy, *Preaching in the First Half Century of New England History* ($3.0).

GEOFFREY BLES: C. S. Lewis *The Great Divorce* (7s. 6d.).

CHURCH OF IRELAND PRINTING AND PUBLISHING CO.: H. R. McAdoo, *The New Church* (9d.).

CROWTHER: Dorothy Hann, *Bible Stories of Christ* (5s.).

DACRE PRESS: J. Barker, C.R., *Grace* (3s.); R. D. Middleton, *Stewards of the Mysteries of God* (2s. 6d.); Hugh of St Victor, *The Soul's Betrothal Gift* (3s.)

EPWORTH PRESS: T. F. Glasson, *The Second Advent* (12s. 6d.).

FORERUNNERS (38, Gordon Sq., W.C.1): *We are To-morrow* (1s.).

HEINEMANN: L. Martindale, *The Prevention of Venereal Disease* (2s. 6d.).

INTER-VARSITY FELLOWSHIP: J. W. Harmer, *The Scripture Lesson* (12s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: F. W. Camfield, *The Collapse of Doubt* (5s.); J. W. Sweetman, *Islam and Christian Theology* (16s.).

MACMILLAN: E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St Peter* (25s.).

NATIONAL SOCIETY: *Music and Pictures for the Sunday Nursery* (n.p.).

NISBET: E. L. Allen, *The Structure of Life* (8s. 6d.); W. R. Matthews, *Strangers and Pilgrims* (8s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: E. A. Peers, *Mother of Carmel* (8s. 6d.); J. L. Hromádka, *Doom and Resurrection* (5s.); J. W. Bowman, *The Intention of Jesus* (8s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: E. T. Davies, *The Political Ideas of Richard Hooker* (6s.); Jessie Powell, *In Him is Life* (2s.).

S.P.C.K. and NATIONAL SOCIETY: Phyllis Saunders, *Singing Games for Sunday* (n.p.); Joyce Cosgrave, *The Story in the Book of Isaiah* (8d.); *Stamps for the Christian Year* (1s.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher